

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-15, and 17-20 were presented for examination. The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-15, and 17-19; and objected to claims 19 and 20. Applicants hereby seek to amend claims 1-3, 6, 7, 10-13, 15, and 18-20 pursuant to the provisions of Rule 116. Support for all amendments is found in the application as originally filed. Reconsideration of this application as amended, and allowance of all claims herein, claims 1-3, 5-15, and 17-20 as amended, are hereby respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that the Examiner should enter the offered amendments, because the amendments adopt the Examiner's suggestions, comply with requirements of form, and place the case in condition for allowance. 37 C.F.R. §1.116; MPEP 714.12, 714.13.

Applicants hereby seek to amend the specification in six places. The amendment to page 10 is to correct a typographical error. The amendments to pages 11 and 12 are to correct grammatical errors.

Applicants hereby seek to amend drawing Figures 2, 3, 3C, 4, 4D, 4G, 4H, and 6. Redlined drawings showing the requested changes are appended hereto. Figures 3, 4, and 6 are being renumbered conventionally. Figure 2 is being amended to add a missing item number. Figures 3C, 4D, 4G, and 4H are being amended to correct typographical errors.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-15, and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Asay in view of Sudia.

Applicants submit that the Examiner's rejection of claim 19 as part of this rejected set of claims was inadvertent, since the Examiner merely objected to claim 19 in another part of his final Office Action, where he indicated that claim 19 contained allowable subject matter.

Applicants hereby seek to amend their claims to more particularly point out novel aspects of their invention.

Amended claim 1 recites that the first customer has contacted the second customer but has not sent a digital signature to the second customer. Asay and Sudia, on the other hand, are limited to mechanisms for verifying digital signatures. Insofar as Asay and Sudia have analogues to Applicants' first customer and second customer, their first customer always sends a digital signature to the second customer. Asay and Sudia, whether taken alone or in combination, do not

suggest how Applicants' novel steps can be performed without the first customer sending a digital signature to the second customer.

Further with respect to claim 1, the Examiner admits that Asay does not disclose the recitations "transmitting the authorization request from the second customer to the second participant;" "transmitting the authorization request from the second participant to the first participant;" "transmitting the response from the first participant to the second participant;" and "transmitting the response from the second participant to the second customer." The Examiner asserts, however, that Sudia discloses these steps in Figure 7. This assertion is traversed. Sudia describes Figure 7 at column 15 lines 13-30. In this passage, Sudia describes just two different entities: signing devices and authorization agents. Regardless of how one analogizes these entities to the entities recited in Applicants' claim 1, Sudia comes up short, because the relevant portions of claim 1 recite three separate entities: the first participant, the second participant, and the second customer.

Claims 2, 3, and 5-9 depend from claim 1, and therefore their patentability flows from the patentability of claim 1.

Further with respect to claim 2, the prior art does not suggest the recitation in claim 2 as amended that "the authorization request is a dynamic request as to whether the individual is authorized to perform a certain act or undertake a particular transaction."

Further with respect to claim 3, the prior art does not suggest the recitation in claim 3 as amended that "the authorization request is a static request for an attribute of a role associated with the individual."

Further with respect to claim 5, the prior art does not suggest the recitation in claim 5 that "access controls are implemented that limit the ability of the second customer to obtain a message format for the authorization request." The Examiner's assertion that Asay discloses this recitation is traversed.

Further with respect to claim 6, the prior art does not suggest the recitation in amended claim 6 that "information pertaining to definitions of attributes is used in preparing the authorization response."

Further with respect to claim 7, the prior art does not suggest the recitation in amended claim 7 that "information pertaining to mapping terminology from the second customer to the first customer is used in preparing the authorization response."

Applicants are hereby rewriting claim 10 into independent form, and changing the dependencies of claims 11 and 12 to depend upon claim 10.

The cited prior art does not suggest the recitations of amended claim 10, for at least the following reasons:

Claim 10 recites an authorization request that is separate and apart from a certificate validation request. Sudia does not show any authorization requests at all. Asay hints at authorization requests (column 6 lines 15-25), but in Asay these are always part of certificate validations. Column 5 lines 1-28, column 10 lines 23-36, column 10 lines 45-51.

Additionally, as discussed above, the cited references do not suggest the recitations "transmitting the authorization request from the second customer to the second participant;" "transmitting the authorization request from the second participant to the first participant;" "transmitting the response from the first participant to the second participant;" and "transmitting the response from the second participant to the second customer."

Claims 11 and 12 now depend from claim 10, and therefore their patentability follows from the patentability of claim 10.

For the above reasons, the Examiner is requested to withdraw his rejections of claims 1-3 and 5-12; and to allow these claims as amended.

The Examiner rejected claims 13-15, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Asay in view of Sudia and further in view of Green.

Applicants hereby seek to amend claims 13-15, 17, and 18 to more particularly point out novel aspects of their invention.

The Examiner asserted that Figure 7 of Asay discloses the recitation of claim 13: "presenting the proposed authorization service to a policy management authority by sending an electronic communication." This assertion is traversed. Figure 7 of Asay pertains solely to the issuance of digital certificates to a user, and does not have anything to do with authorization services. Column 9 lines 64-65.

The Examiner further asserted that Figure 3 of Asay discloses the recitation of claim 13: "receiving approval of the proposed authorization service from the policy management authority via an electronic communication, whereby the proposed authorization service becomes an approved authorization service." This assertion is traversed. Figure 3 of Asay does not show receiving approval of a proposed authorization service. Rather, said Figure 3 shows simply a certificate validation technique in which a reliance server 104 issues secondary digital certificates in some cases.

The Examiner asserted that the passage at column 2 lines 25-29 of Sudia discloses claim 13's recitation of "defining a proposed authorization service." This assertion is traversed. As the cited passage of Sudia makes clear, Sudia is limited to a digital signing system, and does not delve into authorization for confirming the authority of individuals and/or computers to transact on behalf of customers, as recited in amended claim 13. A digital signature system can provide only three things: integrity (proving that the message was not altered in transit), paternity (proving that the entity that purported to sign the message did in fact so sign), and non-repudiation (prohibiting the signer from later repudiating the message he has digitally signed). This is far less than "confirming the authority of individuals and/or computers to transact on behalf of customers."

The Examiner admitted that Asay does not disclose the recitation "the proposed authorization service is developed by a participant and approved by the policy management authority before being offered to customers" (as amended). However, the Examiner asserted that column 8 lines 8-23 of Green discloses this recitation. This assertion is traversed. Green does not have anything to do with authorization services for confirming the authority of individuals and/or computers to transact on behalf of customers, as recited in amended claim 13. Rather, the cited passage of Green pertains solely to the approval of tests and documents. Tests are defined in column 3 lines 10-22 of Green as tests in the conventional pedagogical sense, wherein users test their understanding of policies in the relevant documents.

For the above reasons, the cited prior art, whether taken alone or in combination, does not disclose the novel recitations of claim 13.

Claims 14, 15, 17, and 18 depend from claim 13, and thus their patentability flows from the patentability of claim 13.

For the above reasons, the Examiner is requested to withdraw his rejection of claims 13-15, 17, and 18; and to allow these claims as amended.

The Examiner objected to claims 19 and 20 as being dependent upon a rejected based claim. The Examiner indicated that claims 19 and 20 would be allowable if rewritten into independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants are adopting the Examiner's suggestion, and hereby rewriting claims 19 and 20 into independent form, by means of inserting verbatim the pre-amended language from claim 1 (the independent claim to each of claims 19 and 20) into each of claims 19 and 20.

For the above reasons, the Examiner is requested to withdraw his objection to claims 19 and 20; and to allow these claims as amended.

Applicants believe that this application is now in condition for allowance of all claims herein, claims 1-3, 5-15, and 17-20 as amended, and therefore an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner disagrees or believes that, for any other reason, direct contact with Applicants' attorney would help advance the prosecution of this case to finality, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

date of signature: Nov-22, 2005



Edward J. Radlo
Attorney Under Rule 34
Reg. No. 26,793

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
Tel.: (415) 882-2402

enclosures

cc: IP/T docketing CH (w/encl.)
L. Miller (w/encl.)(via e-mail)
K. Ruthenberg (w/encl.)